10/26/79 jf

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
973 741	12/28/78	Nilssen	78-1226

Dulin, Thienpont, Potthast & Snyder
208 S. La Salle
Ste. 2060
Chicago, IL 60604

MAILED
OCT 30 1979
U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

EXAMINER	
S. H. Grimm	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
232	2

DATE MAILED:

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined. ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire THREE month(s), _____ ~~days~~ from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. ☐ Notice of References Cited, Form PTO-892.
2. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
3. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152.
4. ☐ _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-36 are pending in the application.

   Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-36 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
6. ☒ Claims 1-36 are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ The formal drawings filed on _____ are acceptable.
8. ☐ The drawing correction request filed on _____ has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved.
9. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has
   ☐ been received. ☐ not been received. ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____,
   filed on _____.
10. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
11. ☐ Other

PTOL-326 (rev. 10-78)

EXAMINER'S FIRST ACTION

1. This application is a continuation-in-part of Application Serial No. 890,586, filed March 20, 1978.

2. At page 7, line 20, "15" should be changed to --14--.

3. At page 14, line 10, "transistor" (second occurrence) should be changed to --diode--.

4. At page 15, last line, "130" should be changed to --134--.

5. Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for the following reasons:

a. All of the claims fail to define adequate structural and functional interrelationships of the claimed elements. Also, the claims fail to recite sufficient structural details to define complete circuits. For example, in claim 1, it is not clear how the two transistors are interconnected with each other, with the DC source and with the load; it is not clear from where the first and second drive circuit means obtain "feedback signals" and how these are generated; and it is not clear how the second drive circuit is functionally coordinated with the first drive circuit.

b. In claim 1, line 12, it is not clear what is meant by "subtractive feedback", apparently this

should be changed to --negative feedback--.

c. In claim 5, lines 3-4, "said core of said first drive circuit means" has no antecedent.

d. In claim 6, "first" and "second" current transformers have no proper antecedent.

e. In claim 10, it is unclear whether it is the output transformer or the leakage inductance that is connected to the collectors.

f. In claim 11, "subtractive feedback" is indefinite as in claim 1 above.

g. In claim 14, line 3, after "deliver" should be inserted --to the load--, and this same phrase should be deleted in line 5.

h. In claim 15, it is not clear what is meant by "subtractive bias means".

i. In claim 16, it is unclear whether it is the output transformer or the shunt leakage inductance that is connected to the collectors.

j. Claim 25 is misdescriptive in lines 9-11. The transistor collector voltage can only drop to its lowest value after the transistor has become fully conductive.

k. Claim 31 is misdescriptive; it is the

inverter that is self-oscillating, not the "control means".

l. Claim 33 appears to be misdescriptive. It is not understood how a diode shunting the base-emitter junction of a transistor can clamp the voltage at the collector of the same transistor. Where is the basis for this in the disclosure?

m. Claim 34 appears to be misdescriptive since no shunting diodes across the collector-emitter terminals of the transistors are shown in the drawings.

n. In claim 35, lines 7-8, it is not clear what is meant by "positively conducting control signals"; in line 11 it is not clear what is meant by "subtractive control signals"; and lines 11-14 are misdescriptive since the so-called subtractive control signals are actually applied also before the saturable feedback means has saturated.

o. In claim 36, it is not clear what is meant by "positive control signals" and "subtractive control signals".

6. Claims 1-6, 8, 15, 21, 24-28, 31, 32, and 35 are considered to be generic. There are claims restricted to the two separate species of Figures 1 and 3. Applicant

is required (1) to elect a single disclosed and claimed species under 35 USC 121, even though this requirement be traversed, and (2) to list all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. MPEP 809.02(a).

Siegfried H. Grimm

SIEGFRIED H. GRIMM
EXAMINER
GROUP ART UNIT 252

S. Grimm/jf
703/557/2733
10/26/79